

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of record. The present invention relates to an ink jet recording electrophotographic recording-common paper comprising a support having a cationic resin adhered thereto. As discussed at length in the specification, and as shown in the Examples of the specification, the surface resistivity must be in the range of 1.0×10^9 - 9.9×10^{13} in order to achieve desirable electrophotographic characteristics such as transferability of toner. To ensure such surface resistivity, the amount of the cationic resin must be 0.5-2.0 g/m². Applicants respectfully submit that Idei et. al. does not disclose or suggest that good electrophotographic characteristics can be attained by adjusting the surface resistivity to 1.0×10^9 - 9.9×10^{13} and the amount of the adhered cationic resin to 0.5-2.0 g/m². While Idei et. al. discloses an amount of cationic resin that overlaps the claimed range, it is clear that surface resistivity is not considered by Idei et. al., because the range of cationic resin disclosed is wider than that necessary to achieve the claimed surface resistivity. A person of ordinary skill in the art may gather from Idei et. al. that any value within the ranges listed are equivalent, which was not found and is not shown to be the case by the present inventors in the claimed invention.

Furthermore, when the cationic resin has a cation equivalent of 3-8 meq/g measured by colloidal titration method as specified in claim 2, the surface resistivity can be easily controlled. Idei et. al. does not disclose a specific cation equivalent of the cationic resin, and does not disclose or suggest its importance.

The Examiner asserts that the phrase "measured by colloidal titration method" in claim 2 is product by process language. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is groundless and should be withdrawn. This phrase concerns not a production process but a method of measuring the

Inventor: **Koji IDEI et. al.**
Serial No.: **09/508,617**

Filed: **March 14, 2001**
Group Art Unit: **1774**

cation equivalent. Therefore, claim 2 is not a product by process claim, but an ordinary product claim.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of record be withdrawn, and the present application be given favorable treatment.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by Applicants would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
McLELAND & NAUGHTON, LLP



Kenneth H. Salen
Reg. No. 43,077

Attorney Docket No. **000225**
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 659-2930
Fax: (202) 887-0357
KHS/meu

Q:\FLOATERS\KHS\000225 Amendment.wpd